



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/273,149 03/19/99 PINTAR

K 22074661-255

BAKER & MCKENZIE
805 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10022

TM02/0730

EXAMINER

PAULA C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176
 DATE MAILED:

07/30/01

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/273,149	PINTAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CESAR B PAULA	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE, and preliminary amendment filed on 5/7/2001.
This action is made NON-final.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Mcallum (Pat. # 5,784,635, 7/21/98) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- XUS
7/26/01*
6. Claims 1-6, and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KUWAHARA (Pat. # 6,202,072, 3/13/2001, filed on 12/5/1997).

8-13, 15-20
Regarding independent claim 1, Kuwahara discloses: *A method of converting a plurality of input field--“the present invention generates a conversion form for conversion between a prototype document....and a document type definition ...conversion form can be so that it can be referred to when converting a plain document...to a SGML document”* (Col. 2, lines 22-67).

Art Unit: 2176

Kuwahara teaches above, the conversion of an input source data file into a second output file by using an optimized form generated at runtime for converting an input textual document into SGML format.

Moreover, Kuwahara discloses: *(a) receiving a first attribute of a first input field type and a second attribute--“Three types of information, as shown in Fig. 2, such as a prototype of a plain text document, document type definition....is required for preparation of a SGML conversion form”* (Col. 5, lines 25-67). KUWAHARA teaches above, the conversion of an input plain text document with a first attribute or format into a second output SGML file with a second format attribute for the creation of a conversion form.

Moreover, KUWAHARA discloses: creating at runtime an optimize form for converting a text document to SGML--“The SGML conversion form generation module 101 generates a SGML conversion form file...Three types of information, as shown in Fig. 2, such as a prototype of a plain text document, document type definition....is required for preparation of a SGML conversion form” (Col. 5, lines 25-67, and Col. 7, lines 26-67). KUWAHARA fails to explicitly teach *(b) generating at runtime a first optimized conversion routine.* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have created the routine, because KUWAHARA teaches above the provision of the parameters of the SGML conversion form to application program “AP2B” for performing the optimized conversion functions.

Furthermore, KUWAHARA discloses: *(c) executing said first optimized conversion routine from said application program.... --“the present invention generates a conversion form for conversion between a prototype document.....and a document type definition ...conversion form can be so that it can be referred to when converting a plain document...to a SGML*

Art Unit: 2176

document" (Col. 2, lines 22-67, and Col. 5, lines 11-67). KUWAHARA teaches above, the conversion of an input source data file into a second output file by using an optimized form generated at runtime for converting an input textual document into SGML format.

Claims 2-3 is directed towards a method for performing the steps of claim 1, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, KUWAHARA discloses: *performed dynamically while said application program is executing*-- KUWAHARA discloses: "creating at runtime an optimize form for converting a text document to SGML--"The SGML conversion form generation module 101 generates a SGML conversion form file... Three types of information, as shown in Fig. 2, such as a prototype of a plain text document, document type definition....is required for preparation of a SGML conversion form" (Col. 5, lines 25-67, and Col. 7, lines 26-67). KUWAHARA teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic creation of an optimized conversion form for converting a text document to SGML format.

Claims 5-6 is directed towards a method for performing the conversion of a prototype text document, which includes input fields, and an SGML document DTD having output fields, found claim 1, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 8-12 are directed towards a method for performing the steps of claims 3, 2, 4, 6, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 8, KUWAHARA discloses: *input and output attribute are date type*--"The SGML conversion form generation module 101 generates a SGML conversion form file... Three types of information, as shown in Fig. 2, such as a prototype of a plain text document, document type definition....is required for preparation of a SGML

Art Unit: 2176

conversion form" (Col. 5, lines 25-67, Col. 7, lines 26-67, and Fig. 6). KUWAHARA teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic conversion of an input prototype document into the SGML document, which has a "date" attribute in output field "b".

Claims 15-20 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-4, 13, and 6 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

7. Claims 7, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KUWAHARA, in view of Mcallum (Pat. # 5,784,635, 7/21/98).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, KUWAHARA teaches: "The SGML conversion form generation module 101 generates a SGML conversion form file... Three types of information, as shown in Fig. 2, such as a prototype of a plain text document, document type definition...is required for preparation of a SGML conversion form" (Col. 5, lines 25-67, and Col. 7, lines 26-67). KUWAHARA fails to explicitly teach *generating program debugging instrumentation*. Mcallum discloses: "This updating process, thus, not only corrects keying errors and standardizes syntax" (Col. 5, lines 35-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have debugged the routine, because Mcallum teaches above, the generation of cleaning routines for correcting error syntax rules.

Claim 14 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 7, and is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Examiner has performed a new search and

Art Unit: 2176

consideration of the claims as amended. However, the search turned up a new prior art reference relevant to the claims. The Applicant is directed towards the rejections above, based upon the newly found prior art.

Conclusion

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

- (703) 308-6606, (for informal or draft communications for discussion only, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Application/Control Number: 09/273,149

Page 7

Art Unit: 2176

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

OBP

7/18/01

Heather
HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100